

Appl. No. : 10/781,247
Filed : February 18, 2004

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Support can be found in paragraph [0016] on page 4 and Figs. 1 and 2, for example. Claim 6 has been amended to clarify the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections of Claims 1, 6, and 26-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6, and 26-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,874, hereafter '874) in view of Otsubo et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,776,918, hereafter '918).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1, the Office Action states: "['874 teaches] an electromagnetic wave generator (#28, toroidal plasma source) arranged outside the plasma CVD reactor (above #60)". *Office Action* at page 3, lines 11-13 (emphasis added). In '874, the electromagnetic wave generator is connected to the top of the reactor (#60). Since the showerhead and the susceptor are included in the plasma CVD reactor as defined in Claim 1, in '874, the electromagnetic wave generator cannot be considered to be "connected to a side wall of the reactor at a position between the showerhead and the susceptor and closer to the showerhead than to the susceptor for cleaning an inner surface of the reactor and the showerhead" as defined in amended Claim 1.

In '918, the corresponding "electromagnetic wave generator" is the microwave power magnetron (#3; Fig. 11) is shown connected to the top of the reactor.

Therefore, neither '874 nor '918 teaches or suggests, in any predictable manner, "said electromagnetic wave generator being connected to a side wall of the reactor at a position between the showerhead and the susceptor and closer to the showerhead than to the susceptor for cleaning an inner surface of the reactor and the showerhead" as defined in Claim 1. At least for the reasons above, Claim 1 as amended herein could not be obvious over '874 and '918. Claims 6 and 26-27 also could not be obvious due to their dependencies upon Claim 1.

Additionally, Claim 6 has been amended to clarify the subject matter, in which "only for reactor cleaning" is not merely intended use but results in a structure where the controller is programmed to activate the electromagnetic wave generator only for reactor cleaning and activates the electromagnetic wave generator only for reactor cleaning. Neither '874 nor '918

Appl. No. : 10/781,247
Filed : February 18, 2004

teaches or suggests the above features in any predictable manner. Therefore, additionally for this reason, Claim 6 as amended herein could not be obvious over '874 and '918.

It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims 2-4, 7-8, 23, and 28-29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2-4, 7-8, 23, and 28-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over '874 and '918 further in view of Kabansky (US publication No. 2002-0179248, hereafter '248).

'248 discloses a microwave generator 142 (Fig. 2) connected to an upper part of a reactor, above the "shower head-like" device 162, and does not supply the deficiencies of '874 and '918 discussed above in relation to Claim 1. Thus, Claims 2-4, 7-8, 23, and 28-29 could be obvious over '874, '918, and '248 at least due to their dependencies upon Claim 1.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over '874 and '918 further in view of Houchin et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,202,095, hereafter '095).

'095 discloses a microwave generator connected to an upper part of a reactor and does not supply the deficiencies of '874 and '918 discussed above in relation to Claim 1. Thus, Claim 5 cannot be obvious over '874, '918, and '248 at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims 24-25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over '874, '918, and '248, further in view of Yanase (US publication No. 2002-0117473, hereafter '473).

'473 discloses a microwave induction magnet 14 connected to an upper part of a reactor and does not supply the deficiencies of '874, '918, and '248 discussed above in relation to Claim 1. Thus, Claims 24-25 cannot be obvious over '874, '918, '248, and '473 at least due to its dependency upon Claim 1.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. : 10/781,247
Filed : February 18, 2004

CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The grounds for rejection which are not discussed herein are moot. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: November 18, 2008

By: Adeel S. Akhtar
Adeel S. Akhtar
Registration No. 41,394
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114

6247467_1
111708